

Date: Tue, 7 Jun 94 00:30:02 PDT
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #637
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Tue, 7 Jun 94 Volume 94 : Issue 637

Today's Topics:

 "73's"
 [FWD] CQ Univ. of Maryland
 Bearcat 260 Mods
 FCC computers up!
 Ham Radio few problem (3 msgs)
 Impedence of a car radio antenna
 RFD:Radio repair rip-off??
 TEN-TEC transverter
 TRANSVERTERS
 US ARMY RADIOS

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 6 Jun 1994 17:08:40 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!cs.utexas.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!
europa.eng.gtefsd.com!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!nntp.cs.ubc.ca!psgrain!news.tek.com!
tekig7!gaulandm@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: "73's"
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <CqzCr0.908@spk.hp.com> dubner@spk.hp.com (Joe Dubner) writes:
> Have you ever noticed the ingenious excuses that a ham will use
> when he wants to terminate a QSO. Rather than hurt the QSOee's feelings
> by saying he'd rather read yesterday's newspaper than continue the QSO
> any longer, a ham will find some "crisis" needing his attention.
> [Genuine, on-air excuses removed for brevity]

I'm sure we've all noticed such behavior. Often, two hams will spend more time trying to convince each other how sorry they are to have to end the QSO, then they do in actual conversation. The following recreation is typical:

KG70S: CQ, CQ, CQ, this is KG70S calling CQ and listening...

KB7LVU: KG70S KG70S this is KB7LVU KB7LVU over

KG70S: KB7LVU, you are 59 in Vancouver, Washington. How copy?

KB7LVU: KG70S, you are also 59 in Seattle.

KG70S: Roger, LVU. Sorry, old man, but I have to QRT now.
The wife asked me to put the cat out, and if I don't,
she'll throw *me* out.

KB7LVU: Yeah, I know what you mean. I have to go, too. My
daughter asked me to do a few things for her today.

KG70S: I'd love to hear about it, but the cat's really starting
to smolder now. I really should throw some water on
him or something..

KB7LVU: Uh-oh! They just started the wedding march. If I don't
get downstairs before she starts walking down the aisle,
I'll never hear the end of it! 73 from KB7LVU!

KG70S: Oops! That stupid cat's got the draperies burning now,
too! 73! KG70S Clear!

Of course, six seconds later, KG70S was calling CQ down 5, and KB7LVU switched bands and did the same. While Miss Manners would no doubt approve of each ham's efforts to spare the feelings of the other, as do I, such herculean efforts are a needless waste of bandwidth. On the other extreme, one ham would go suffer from selective deafness on hearing the other's call, and the conversation would not take place at all. Slightly less extreme would be brutal honesty:

. . .
KG70S: Roger, LVU. Look, you sound like a real jerk, so why
don't you go away, and give someone with half a brain
a chance at answering my call?

KB7LVU: Sure thing, OS. I've got better things to do than
talk to an old geezer like you. Why don't you go
downt to the hypochondriac net on 160, and tell them

all about your prostate surgery?

KG7OS: Why you whippersnapper, I oughta...

...and so on. You get the idea: though more honest, the direct approach still wastes bandwidth. I propose we replace "73" (and its illegitimate and much disdained sibling, "73s"), with the following:

129: No offense, Methusela, but I'd rather chat with someone born in this century. So long, and don't overdose on your Geritol!

3: No offense, sonny-boy, but I'd rather talk to a grown-up. Can you give mommy or daddy the microphone?

35: Sorry, but if my wife caught me talking to a YL she'd take a sledgehammer to my rig, and then go after me. (on a repeater, this can be followed with an invitation to meet somewhere for an "eyeball" (or is it "eyefull"?)).

6: California is NOT "DX". I said "CQ DX", not "CQ IDIOTS"

7.5: You're a bit dim. Turn off your radio, and let me talk to a person with a brain.

40: Huh? Are you still yakking away? Get lost before you put me to sleep.

This only covers a few of the many possibilities, but you can easily see how much more efficient this would be:

...
KG7OS: 7.5!

KB7LVU: 129!

I'm sure the ARRL is already collecting suggestions, and will shortly submit a list to the FCC for approval. Start planning now what you'll do with all the bandwidth that will be released!

--

Michael A. Gauland gaulandm@tekig7.PEN.TEK.COM
AA7JF (503) 627-5067

Date: 7 Jun 94 03:12:26 GMT

From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: [FWD] CQ Univ. of Maryland
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

>I'll be working at the University of Maryland between June 17th and
>July 3rd, staying in College Park, and am wondering if there's
>much local ham activity - clubs etc?
> >Any info. appreciated,
>73 Simon G0GWA. >

Depends on what you mean by "local". DC and College Park sit
on the Nations Capital, lots of two, 1.25, and 3/4 meter repeaters (if
you're into VHF/UHF), lots of clubs that do other things.

Your time period goes across the ARRL sponsored "field day", an
adventure in its self. UMD has a club station I do believe, but
I dont recall its callsign.

jd

Date: Mon, 6 Jun 1994 12:38:33 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
gatech!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Bearcat 260 Mods
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Jun5.213844.14551@nuchat.sccsi.com> acs@news.sccsi.com (A.C.
Spraggins) writes:

>
>Hi All:
>I'm still looking for mods and/or a schematic for the Bearcat 260.
>Anybody out there in cyberspace have any info? Tnx fr the help.

Call Uniden's Parts and Service center in Indianapolis, the nice
lady will take your credit card number and FedEx you the nice thick
service manual, \$20. I got one for my 760XLT the next day. Everything
you ever wanted to know about your Bearcat scanner is in there, including
stuff I've never seen in mod files.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Mon, 6 Jun 1994 13:55:12 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: FCC computers up!
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <Cqz68v.C5v@ra.nrl.navy.mil> drumhell@claudette.nrl.navy.mil (David Drumheller) writes:

>
> Which raises an interesting question... How long does it take to get
>*any* kind of license for those services regulated under the Private Radio
>Bureau, or are common carriers? For example, how long does it take to get
>a license for GMRS or business band?

GMRS takes about 12 weeks, though they cash your check quicker than that. Land mobile, other than itinerant, takes a bit longer since it has to be cleared through the frequency coordination process. Broadcast can take *years*. We were finally issued our license *renewal* 2.5 years after our application, just in time to start the whole #\$\$% process over again. (We operated under temporary authority in the interim.) The wheels of bureaucracy grind exceedingly slowly.

Gary

--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

Date: Mon, 6 Jun 1994 15:27:21 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Ham Radio few problem
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Jun4.214420.14228@cs.brown.edu> md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>jws@fc.hp.com (John Schmidt) writes:

>
>>Just my opinion, but I view PL as more of a necessity to clean operation than
>>an access mechanism. My personal idea of an effective access restriction would
>>be to require a tone sequence on a control frequency to open the repeat
>>function, or a digital-burst squelch type of mechanism on the input frequency.
>

>And neither of these methods are realistic for normal, end-user access
>to the machine. Perhaps for control functions, but certainly not for

>everyday access. Some reasons why:

>

>1. The equipment to perform this function is not widely available to a
> majority of users within the existing radios sold by equipment
> manufacturers (although some are starting to include DTMF squelch as
> "standard" options).

>

>2. Requiring a third frequency for control purposes reduces the amount of
> available bandwidth for others to use. Now a repeater will take three
> frequencies instead of two.

>

>3. The complexity of activating the machine may be more complicated than
> some people can understand properly.

Tsk, tsk, such is the price of cliquish exclusivity.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Mon, 6 Jun 1994 15:54:45 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Ham Radio few problem

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Jun5.132936.24651@cs.brown.edu> md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>jws@fc.hp.com (John Schmidt) writes:

>

>> A closed carrier operated system sounds like an oxymoron to me, unless you
>> have someone playing channel cop 24 hours a day. If you have several
>> members who don't have a real life, maybe you can do that.

>

>Since a repeater trustee is responsible for all traffic rebroadcast through
>his/her machine, he certainly should have control operators capable of
>monitoring the system all day.

Your assertion is false. A repeater may operate under automatic control, 97.205(d). A control operator need not be present when a station is operated under automatic control, 97.109(d). A station licensee operating a station under automatic control is only obligated to cease automatic operations if notified by the Engineer In Charge of his district of harmful

interference, 97.109(d). The FCC has consistently ruled that it is the originating station who is responsible for improper content of automatically repeated transmissions. Only in the case of third party traffic is a repeater licensee responsible for content, 97.109(e). No phone patch, no problems.

Don't be misled by recent FCC statements regarding digital messaging systems (IE they mean BBSs). In that case, all retransmissions involve third party traffic.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Mon, 6 Jun 1994 15:36:46 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Ham Radio few problem

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Jun4.215748.14490@cs.brown.edu> md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>rogjd@netcom.com (Roger Buffington) writes:

>

>> Comments like that are not helpful or contributory. They simply have a
>> tendency to piss people off. I seem to recall you lecturing someone on
>> this thread about how this or that behavior would cause the person to not
>> make many friends. Accusing others of "want(ing) a free ride....."etc.
>> is just a way to disregard the real thrust of what is being discussed
>> here and instead lower the quality of the discourse to a level you are
>> for some reason more comfortable with.

>

>Sorry Roger, that's the way I see it. Legal and moral issues aside, the
>advocates of no-closed/all-open repeater coordination feel they shouldn't
>shouldn't have to pay to access spectrum that "belongs" to everyone.

And indeed that's correct. The spectrum is a commons.

>And, while I may agree that its a good policy to promote as many open
>systems as possible, I also recognize that systems are expensive to
>set up and maintain - especially good systems with many links,
>remotes, and excellent coverage. Hence, if those trustees wish to
>restrict access to the machine to "members only", that's their
>right.

NO! It is not legal to operate an amateur radio station *for hire*. That's what you're doing when you restrict access to only those who pay to use your system. Get a commercial license if you want to operate a radio business.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Tue, 7 Jun 1994 01:37:16 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!srngenprp!alanb@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Impedence of a car radio antenna
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Shehzad N Khan (snkhan@mason1.gmu.edu) wrote:
: What is the impedence of a normal car antenna in the US?
: I have to couple my amplifier circuit with the car antenna.

I assume you want to use the car antenna on other than the broadcast bands. I use my car antenna ('87 Accura Legend) on 144, 220 and 440 MHz with a homebrew band-switched tuner.

The actual antenna impedance is not of much interest, since the impedance at the other end of the coax will be completely different. It will depend on the antenna length, coax length, and coax impedance. (And to a lesser extent on the antenna placement and shape of the car body.) I suggest doing what I did -- Just hook up a good VHF SWR meter and fiddle with the matching network until you get a 1:1 SWR.

AL N1AL

Date: Tue, 7 Jun 1994 01:50:52 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!srngenprp!alanb@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: RFD:Radio repair rip-off??
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Jim Revkin (revco@YALE.EDU) wrote:
: ... So I
: left it off a a local repair shop and told the owner I though it might

: well need new finals and alignment. He charged me a \$45 "bench fee"
: which would not be refundable but would be credited toward the repairs,
: and bascially sat on the set for a couple of weeks. They send the
: work out to a technician. Anyway when I called back for the estimate
: they gave me a quote of \$225 to \$250. It was apparent that they never
: actually opened up the set, and that the quote was based on my
: impression that it might need new finals and alignment.

Many years ago I worked briefly (a few weeks) at a stereo/TV repair shop.
The owner was, IMO, a crook, if not legally then at least morally. Prices
were based more on what he thought the customer was willing to pay than on
what it actually cost to fix the set.

If the customer asked how long the repair would take, I was supposed to
say "a week." But I knew that there were shelves full of sets waiting
to be worked on in the back room. If an irate customer came in weeks
later wanting to know where his equipment was, I was supposed to say
"on the bench waiting for parts." (That way, the customer couldn't
yank his equipment and go somewhere else.)

The owner got all his business by going through the paperwork to qualify
as an authorized warrantee repair center for just about every consumer
electronics vendor known to man. You see, that way he don't have to
depend on repeat customers to stay in business.

The whole experience accounts for much of my lost naievte as a young man.
:=)

AL N1AL

Date: Mon, 06 Jun 1994 14:54:36 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!
cass.ma02.bull.com!claudelzds-oem!news@network.ucsd.edu (Reid Simmons -
r.simmons@zds.com)
Subject: TEN-TEC transverter
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Jun1.104107.1@leif> jcraig@kean.ucs.mun.ca writes:
>In article <2shqit\$bi0@usenet.INS.CWRU.Edu>, co128@cleveland.Freenet.Edu (James J
Martin) writes:
>>
>> Ten Tec 6 meter transverter kit (1208) for up to 5 Watts in on
>> 20 meters will give you 8 Watts out on 6.
>^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
>>
>> kit \$95.00

>> assembled \$159.00
>>
>> There has been a delay in shipping.
>> --
>> JIM MARTIN W8AC
>> co128@cleveland.freenet.edu
>
>
>Does the xvtr really use the 20m IF? Most use 28 Mc/s so more of the
>band can be covered, ie 28-30 -> 50-52. Also, is the TT xvtr typical
>of TT design and quality?
>
>Joe VO1NA
>

I called Ten-Tec with questions about the 6 meter transverter and they faxed me the schematic. I'm impressed with the circuit (16 transistor design). The SSB/AM/CW activity on 6 is at the extreme low end of the band (<50.5 MHz), above that is mostly Radio Control (for model airplanes, and FM repeaters). I plan on using mine with my TEN-TEC OMNI VI which tunes up to 14.530 on the 20 meter band - plenty of frequency coverage for serious 6 meter work.

Reid NZ8K

Date: Mon, 06 Jun 1994 14:35:55 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!
cass.ma02.bull.com!claudelzds-oem!news@network.ucsd.edu (Reid Simmons -
r.simmons@zds.com)
Subject: TRANSVERTERS
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Jun1.104107.1@leif> jcraig@kean.uccs.mun.ca writes:
>In article <2shqit\$bi0@usenet.INS.CWRU.Edu>, co128@cleveland.Freenet.Edu (James J
Martin) writes:
>>
>> Ten Tec 6 meter transverter kit (1208) for up to 5 Watts in on
>> 20 meters will give you 8 Watts out on 6.
>^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
>>
>> kit \$95.00
>> assembled \$159.00
>>
>> There has been a delay in shipping.
>> --
>> JIM MARTIN W8AC

>> co128@cleveland.freenet.edu

>

>

>Does the xvtr really use the 20m IF? Most use 28 Mc/s so more of the
>band can be covered, ie 28-30 -> 50-52. Also, is the TT xvtr typical
>of TT design and quality?

>

>Joe VO1NA

>

Date: 5 Jun 94 23:13:00 GMT

From: uchineews!ncar!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!pipex!demon!seuk.com!eccles!

Dave.Smith@rsch.wisc.edu

Subject: US ARMY RADIOS

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Hi,

I am trying to find out where I might be able to get hold of any parts or manuals
on the following US Army Radios.

PRC-6 7 &8

PRC-25

these were the main back pack radios used during the Vietnam War by US troops

any one how has or knows of were I might be able to get hold of manuals or radios
them selfs let me know please. I have been trying to get at least one of these
radios for some time. I mainly want the PRC-25..

any help at all would be greatfully recieved.

Regards,

Dave G7PKS.

--

Standard disclaimer: My views are strictly my own.

Date: Mon, 6 Jun 1994 14:02:08 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <rogjdCqunyu.4rC@netcom.com>, <CqyMzM.KnI@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
<rogjdCqz6Lq.F0z@netcom.com>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: Reality check (was Re: Ham Radio few problem)

In article <rogjdCqz6Lq.F0z@netcom.com> rogjd@netcom.com (Roger Buffington) writes:

>Jeffrey Herman (jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu) wrote:

>

>: You might want to 'read the mail' for a couple of months before you become
>: too critical.

>

>Sorry Jeff, doesn't hold water. I don't know anything about what was
>said back in December, that is true. But your characterization of Dana's
>comments in this thread is unfair and highly inaccurate. Very highly
>inaccurate.

>

>I would suspect that the same can be said of the earlier comments based
>on the distortion of the current comments?

You catch on fast. Ask Jeff how the bathroom patrols are going.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Mon, 6 Jun 1994 15:23:59 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2slc6j\$kkn@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>, <gregCqtnE8.H5o@netcom.com>,
<2snjlc\$72p@nyx10.cs.du.edu>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

In article <2snjlc\$72p@nyx10.cs.du.edu> jmaynard@nyx10.cs.du.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:

>In article <gregCqtnE8.H5o@netcom.com>, Greg Bullough <greg@netcom.com> wrote:
>>The 'closed' repeater has been the counter-example to the 'no-one owns
>>a frequency' principle which has guided amateur radio for its entire
>>existence. I see no reason to turn away from the older principle in order
>>to keep the price of exclusivity low.

>

>I don't claim that a coordinated repeater - open or closed - or its users own
>a frequency. I do claim, and the FCC and courts back me up, that the trustee

>of any repeater can legitimately prevent anyone he desires from using HIS
>STATION! IT'S THE STATION, STUPID!

The FCC claims that a coordinated machine has priority on a channel pair,
THAT'S SPECTRUM, STUPID!

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Mon, 6 Jun 1994 17:20:16 GMT
From: world!dts@uunet.uu.net
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2sngi3\$ms9@usenet.INS.CWRU.Edu>, <CquEr3.8FH@spdc.ti.com>,
<gregCqwpJM.K35@netcom.com>o
Subject : Re: ** WAITING PERIOD FOR LICENSE ?? **

In article <gregCqwpJM.K35@netcom.com> greg@netcom.com (Greg Bullough) writes:
>In article <CquEr3.8FH@spdc.ti.com> serafin@spdc.ti.com (Mike Serafin) writes:
>>Merle Rutschke (al372@cleveland.Freenet.Edu) wrote:

>>

>>: TO ALL:

>>

>>: Does anyone reading this message know the current waiting period

>>: for the no-code Tech license from the FCC?

>>

>>12 weeks. KC5GRW received his Tech license, TODAY, which marked the exact end

>>of 12 weeks from the date on which the exam was taken.

>

>And remember, when you vote for your ARRL director, that the League opposed
>the plan that would have had you on the air as soon as you passed, instead
>of cooling your heels, losing interest and code speed (if the latter applies)
>in the mean-time.

>

>Greg

Be fair, Greg, and mention all the reasons against the proposal. It would
have created a nightmare situation because of the impossibility of tracing
who was newly licensed and who was bootlegging.

The League has been pushing the FCC to implement Electronic Filing of

applications, whereby the FCC would NOT have to waste time keying the data. The ARRL VEC has been online to do this for some time, and the bottlenecks on this have been at the FCC end (getting the new computers online, etc.).

Please keep in mind that the ARRL has been working on SENSIBLE solutions to the licensing delay issue when you go and vote.

— —

Daniel Senie	Internet:	dts@world.std.com
Daniel Senie Consulting		n1jeb@world.std.com
508-779-0439	Compuserve:	74176,1347

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #637
